



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 09/781,361 | 02/12/2001 | John E. Cronin | ipCG-509 | 2468 |
| 7590 | 11/02/2005 | | EXAMINER | |
| Ryan Simmous ip Capital Group, Inc Suite 325 400 Cornerstone Drive Williston, VT 05495 | | | HOLMES, MICHAEL B. | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2121 | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 11/02/2005 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 09/781,361 | CRONIN, JOHN E. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Michael B. Holmes | 2121 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE (3) MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 August 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 2,3,5,7,8,10 and 12-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 2,3,5,7,8,10 and 12-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 - www.uspto.gov

Examiner's Detailed Office Action

1. This Office Action is responsive to communication received on March 04, 2004. Amendment under 37 CFR § 1.111. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application is respectfully requested by applicant. All such supporting documentation has been placed in applicant's file.
2. Applicant's arguments filed March 04, 2004, have been fully considered, however, they are not persuasive.
3. Claims 1, 4, 6, 9 & 11 have been canceled.
4. Claims 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 10 and 12 have been amended.
5. Claims 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 10 and 12-22 have been examined.

Claim Objection(s)

6. Claim 19 references steps (c)(iv) & (c)(v) of which are not represented. Appropriate corrections is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

7. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

8. The invention as disclosed in claims 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 10 and 12-21 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being non-statutory subject matter. While applicant's invention is directed towards technological arts. Applicant's claim language is not limited to practical applications. Examiner contends the claimed subject matter, to be one of three exclusions recognized, outside the statutory category of invention, an abstract idea, e.g., claim 1 refers to a "*concept of ladder of abstraction.*" Moreover, the aforementioned claims, they appear to be an abstract idea, lacking a practical application which produces a useful, concrete, and tangible results. In Sarkar, 588 F.2d at 1335, 200 USPQ at 139, the court explained why this approach must be followed:

No mathematical equation can be used, as a practical matter, without establishing and substituting values for the variables expressed therein. Substitution of values dictated by the formula has thus been viewed as a form of mathematical step. If the steps of gathering and substituting values were alone sufficient, every mathematical equation, formula, or algorithm having any practical use would be per se subject to patenting as a "process" under 101. Consideration of whether the substitution of specific values is enough to convert the disembodied ideas present in the formula into an embodiment of those ideas, or into an application of the formula, is foreclosed by the current state of the law.

9. Furthermore, for such subject matter to be statutory, the claimed process must be limited to a practical application of the abstract idea or mathematical algorithm in the technological arts.

See Alappat, 33 F.3d at 1543, 31 USPQ2d at 1556-57 (quoting Diamond v. Diehr, 450 U.S. at 192, 209 USPQ at 10). See also Alappat 33 F.3d at 1569, 31 USPQ2d at 1578-79 (Newman,

Art Unit: 2121

J., concurring) (“unpatentability of the principle does not defeat patentability of its practical applications”) (citing *O ’Reilly v. Morse*, 56 U.S. (15 How.) at 114-19). A claim is limited to a practical application when the method or system, as claimed, produces a concrete, tangible and useful result; i.e., the method recites a step or act of producing something that is concrete, tangible and useful. *See AT &T*, 172 F.3d at 1358, 50 USPQ2d at 1452. *See MPEP § 2106(IV)* Applicant is advised to make the appropriate corrections in an attempt to gain patentability. The claimed invention as a whole must accomplish a practical application. That is, it must produce a “useful, concrete and tangible result.” *State Street*, 149 F.3d at 1373, 47 USPQ2d at 1601-02. Remember, the claims define the property rights provided by a patent, and thus require careful scrutiny. Therefore, it is not enough to set forth invention in the specification. The claims must also reflect the scope and breath of applicant’s invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 13, 16, 19 & 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Klenosky, David B.; Gengler, Charles E.; & Mulvey, Michael S. “Understanding the Factors Influencing Ski Destination Choice: A Means-End Analytic Approach” Journal of Leisure Research*, 1993, Vol. 25, No. 4, in view of *Pressman, David*, 1937 - PATENT IT YOURSELF (6th ed., 1997), (Nolo Press Berkeley).

Regarding claims 13 & 22. *Klenosky et al.* discloses a method and an article for producing an invention document comprising the steps of: (a) communicating to at least one inventor the concept of ladder of abstraction [*see Means-End Theory & General Methodology for Assessing Means-End Relationships*, page 363-365]; (b) interviewing said at least one inventor to identify or otherwise characterize a basic invention [*see Means-End Theory & General Methodology for Assessing Means-End Relationships*, page 363-365]; (c) questioning said at least one inventor with how-type questions relating to the functioning of said basic invention, said how-type questions structured so as to elicit at least one response from said at least one inventor directed to enabling at least one detail of said basic invention [*see Means-End Theory & General Methodology for Assessing Means-End Relationships*, page 363-365, *It is the examiner's position that employing any combination of the following question word types ("why" and "how") will accomplish the goal of eliciting a response(s), and is thus the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.]; (d) iterating steps (b) and (c) at least once [*see Means-End Theory & General Methodology for Assessing Means-End Relationships*, page 363-365].*

Klenosky et al. does not discloses the limitation of: (e) recording in an invention document subject matter of at least some of said responses elicited from said inventor in steps (b)-(d).

However, *Pressman* discloses the limitation of: (e) recording in an invention document subject matter of at least some of said responses elicited from said inventor in steps (b)-(d) [*see Chapter 3, Documentation Can Be Vital*, pages 3 / 2 - 3 / 4]. It would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a persons having ordinary skill in the art to combine *Klenosky et al.* with *Pressman* because when it comes to inventing, good documentation is even more vital than in most other aspects of our lives [see A. Introduction, page 3/2].

12. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Klenosky, David B.; Gengler, Charles E.; & Mulvey, Michael S. "Understanding the Factors Influencing Ski Destination Choice: A Means-End Analytic Approach"* Journal of Leisure Research, 1993, Vol. 25, No. 4 in view of *Pressman, David, 1937 - PATENT IT YOURSELF* (6th ed., 1997), (Nolo Press Berkeley).

Regarding claim 16. *Klenosky et al.* discloses a method of producing an invention document, comprising the steps of: (a) communicating to at least one inventor the concept of ladder of abstraction [see General Methodology for Assessing Means-End Relationships, page 364-365]. (b) identifying a basic invention having a plurality of aspects [see Means-End Theory & General Methodology for Assessing Means-End Relationships, page 363-365]; (c) selecting a first questioning theme selected to elicit from said at least one inventor at least one enhancement of at least one of said plurality of aspects of said basic invention [see Means-End Theory & General Methodology for Assessing Means-End Relationships, page 363-365]; (d) eliciting from said at least one inventor at least one of said plurality of aspects of said basic invention that relates to said first questioning theme [see Means-End Theory & General Methodology for Assessing Means-End Relationships, page 363-365]; (e) eliciting from said at least one inventor via said first questioning theme said at least one enhancement [see Means-End Theory & General Metho-

dology for Assessing Means-End Relationships, page 363-365]; (f) repeating steps (c)-(e) at least one time for alternate ones of said plurality of aspects within said first questioning theme [*see Means-End Theory & General Methodology for Assessing Means-End Relationships*, page 363-365]; (g) repeating steps (c)-(e) at least one time for at least one second questioning theme [*see Means-End Theory & General Methodology for Assessing Means-End Relationships*, page 363-365].

Klenosky et al. does not discloses the limitation of: (h) recording in an invention document subject matter of at least some of said responses elicited from said inventor in steps (b)-(d).

However, *Pressman* discloses the limitation of: (h) recording in an invention document subject matter of at least some of said responses elicited from said inventor in steps (b)-(d) [*see Chapter 3, Documentation Can Be Vital*, pages 3 / 2 - 3 / 4]. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a persons having ordinary skill in the art to combine *Klenosky et al.* with *Pressman* because when it comes to inventing, good documentation is even more vital than in most other aspects of our lives [*see A. Introduction*, page 3/2].

13. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Klenosky, David B.; Gengler, Charles E.; & Mulvey, Michael S.* "Understanding the Factors Influencing Ski Destination Choice: A Means-End Analytic Approach" *Journal of Leisure Research*, 1993, Vol. 25, No. 4, in view of *Pressman, David*, 1937 - PATENT IT YOURSELF (6th ed., 1997), (Nolo Press Berkeley).

Regarding claim 19. *Klenosky et al.* discloses a method of producing an invention document, comprising the steps of (a) communicating to at least one inventor the concept of ladder of abstraction [*see Means-End Theory & General Methodology for Assessing Means-End Relationships*, page 363-365]; (c) defining detail of said basic invention by performing at least one of the steps of: (i) interviewing said at least one inventor to identify or otherwise characterize said basic invention; (ii) questioning said at least one inventor with how-type questions relating to the functioning of said basic invention, said how-type questions structured so as to elicit at least one response from said at least one inventor directed to enabling at least one detail of said basic invention [*see Means-End Theory & General Methodology for Assessing Means-End Relationships*, page 363-365, *It is the examiner's position that employing any combination of the following question word types ("why" and "how") will accomplish the goal of eliciting a response(s), and is thus the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.*]; (d) growing said basic invention, wherein said basic invention has a plurality of aspects, by performing at least one of the steps of: (i) selecting a first questioning theme selected to elicit from at least one inventor at least one enhancement to at least one of said plurality of aspects of said basic invention [*see Means-End Theory & General Methodology for Assessing Means-End Relationships*, page 363-365]; (ii) eliciting from said at least one inventor at least one of said plurality of aspects of said basic invention that relates to said first questioning theme [*see Means-End Theory & General Methodology for Assessing Means-End Relationships*, page 363-365]; (iii) eliciting from said at least one inventor via said first questioning theme said at

least one enhancement [*see Means-End Theory & General Methodology for Assessing Means-End Relationships*, page 363-365].

Klenosky et al. does not disclose the limitations of: (b) communicating to said at least one inventor at least one of the concepts selected from the group consisting of: (i) a basic invention being a function of the problem to be solved by said basic invention, the element(s) that comprise said basic invention, and how the element(s) are connected or interrelated; (ii) prior art, novelty, nonobviousness, inventive step, and bar dates; (iii) inventorship; and (iv) enablement and written description; and (v) iterating steps (b)(i) and (b)(ii) at least once; and (e) including in an invention document subject matter of at least some of said responses elicited from said at least one inventor in steps (b)(ii) and (b)(iii) and at least some of said enhancements elicited from said at least one inventor in steps (c)(iii)-(c)(v).

However, *Pressman*. discloses the limitations of: (b) communicating to said at least one inventor at least one of the concepts selected from the group consisting of: (i) a basic invention being a function of the problem to be solved by said basic invention, the element(s) that comprise said basic invention, and how the element(s) are connected or interrelated [*see G. Software and Other Computer-Related Inventions*, page 8 / 7 – 8 / 8 (left column, fifth paragraph)]; (ii) prior art [*see C. The Novelty and Unobviousness Requirement*, page 1 / 4 “*prior art ...*”], novelty [*see C. The Novelty and Unobviousness Requirement*, page 1 / 4 “*novelty requirement ...*”], nonobviousness [*see C. The Novelty and Unobviousness Requirement*, page 1 / 4 “*unobvious ...*”], inventive step [*see B. Inventing by Problem Recognition and Solution*, page 2 / 2, “*Now that you know what an invention ... 1) recognizing a problem, and 2) fashioning a solution.*”], and bar dates [*see Experi-*

ment exception vi. Prior Sale or On-Sale Status in the U.S, page 5 / 12-5 / 13 “*35 U.S.C. 102 statutory bar*”), (iii) inventorship [*see A. What I mean by “Invention”* page 2 / 2 “*For the purpose of this book ... useful.*”], and (iv) enablement and written description [*see G. Software and Other Computer-Related Inventions*, page 8 / 7 –8 / 8 (*see page 8 / 8, left column, second paragraph, “The special consideration applicable to software inventions is in meeting the full disclosure requirement. ... That is, make absolutely sure it contains a “full, clear, concise, and exact” description of the invention and how to make and use it.“*], and (iii) iterating steps (b)(i) and (b)(ii) at least once [*see G. The Patentability Flowchart* page 5 / 21 – 5 / 23], and (e) including in an invention document subject matter of at least some of said responses elicited from said at least one inventor in steps (b)(ii) and (b)(iii) and at least some of said enhancements elicited from said at least one inventor in steps (c)(iii)-(c)(v) [*see Chapter 3, Documentation Can Be Vital, pages 3 / 2 - 3 / 4*]. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a persons having ordinary skill in the art to combine *Klenosky et al.* with *Pressman* because when it comes to inventing, good documentation is even more vital than in most other aspects of our lives [*see A. Introduction, page 3/2*].

Regarding claim 2. *Pressman* discloses the method of claim 13 wherein the said basic invention is identified and/or characterized by accomplishing any one or more of the following steps: (a) facilitating drawing of a diagram of the said basic invention [*see E. Flowchart page 8/5 & 8/6*]; (b) facilitating definition of one or more elements of the said basic invention; and (c) facilitating definition of problem(s) solved and/or problems to be solved by the said basic invention.

Regarding claim 3. *Pressman* discloses the method of claim 13 further comprising the step of communicating to said at least one inventor any one or more concepts selected from the group consisting of: (a) said basic invention being a function of the problem to be solved by said basic invention, the element(s) that comprise the basic invention, and how the elements are connected or interrelated; (b) prior art, novelty, nonobviousness, inventive step, and bar dates; (c) inventorship; and (d) enablement and written description [*see G. Software and Other Computer-Related Inventions*, page 8 / 7 – 8 / 8 (*see page 8 / 8, left column, second paragraph, “The special consideration applicable to software inventions is in meeting the full disclosure requirement. ... That is, make absolutely sure it contains a “full, clear, concise, and exact” description of the invention and how to make and use it.“]*]

Regarding claim 5. *Pressman* discloses the method of claim 13 further comprising the step of documenting and/or recording administrative information [*see Chapter 3, Documentation Can Be Vital*, pages 3 / 2 - 3 / 9].

Regarding claim 7. *Pressman* discloses the method of claim 16 wherein said at least one second questioning theme is selected from the group consisting of: (a) disadvantages of said basic invention; (b) advantages of said basic invention; (c) operability issue(s); (d) other ways to solve a same problem; (e) licensing strategies [*see G. Licensing of Invention – An Overview*, page 16 / 8 – 16 / 13]; and (f) identification of competitors and/or competitive products.

Art Unit: 2121

Regarding claim 8. *Pressman* discloses the method of claim 16 further comprising prior to the step of communicating to said at least one inventor any one or more concepts selected from the group consisting of: (a) said basic invention being a function of the problem to be solved by said basic invention, the element(s) that comprise said basic invention, and how the element(s) are connected or interrelated; (b) prior art, novelty, nonobviousness, inventive step, and bar dates; (c) inventorship; and (d) enablement and written description [*see G. Software and Other Computer-Related Inventions*, page 8 / 7 –8 / 8 (*see page 8 / 8*, left column, second paragraph, “*The special consideration applicable to software inventions is in meeting the full disclosure requirement. ... That is, make absolutely sure it contains a “full, clear, concise, and exact” description of the invention and how to make and use it.*“]

Regarding claim 10. *Pressman* discloses the method of claim 16 further comprising the step of documenting and/or recording administrative information [*see Chapter 3, Documentation Can Be Vital*, pages 3 / 2 - 3 / 9].

Regarding claim 12. *Pressman* discloses the method of claim 19 wherein said at least one second questioning theme is selected from the group consisting of (a) disadvantages of said basic invention; (b) advantages of said basic invention; (c) operability issue(s); (d) other ways to solve a same problem; (e) licensing strategies [*see G. Licensing of Invention – An Overview*, page 16 / 8 – 16 / 13]; and (f) identification of competitors and/or competitive products.

Regarding claim 14, 17 & 20. *Pressman* discloses wherein said invention document is an invention disclosure form [*see N. File the Information Disclosure Statement Within Three Months*, page 10 / 22 - 10 / 23].

Regarding claim 15, 18 & 21. *Pressman* discloses the wherein said invention document is an application to a governmental patent office [*see M. Receipt That Application Was Received in PTO*, page 10 / 22].

Examiner's Note

14. Claim 19 refers to an iterative step (d)(iv) & (d)(iv), respectively. It is the examiner's position that the combination of *Klenosky* with *Pressman* discloses the limitations step-by-step. However, due to the complexity inherent within the iterative processing, the examiner opted to break it down as follows:

(iv) repeating steps (c)(ii)-(c)(iii) at least one time for alternate ones of said plurality of aspects within said first questioning theme; and

Klenosky discloses (iv) repeating steps (c)(ii) at least one time for alternate ones of said plurality of aspects within said first questioning theme [*see Means-End Theory & General Methodology for Assessing Means-End Relationships*, page 363-365]; and

Pressman discloses (iv) repeating steps (c)(iii) at least one time for alternate ones of said plurality of aspects within said first questioning theme [*see G. The Patentability Flowchart* page 5 / 21 – 5 / 23].

(v) repeating steps (c)(i)-(c)(iv) at least one time for at least one second questioning theme.

Klenosky discloses (v) repeating steps (c)(i) at least one time for at least one second questioning theme [see Means-End Theory & General Methodology for Assessing Means-End Relationships, page 363-365].

Klenosky discloses (v) repeating steps (c)(ii) at least one time for at least one second questioning theme [see Means-End Theory & General Methodology for Assessing Means-End Relationships, page 363-365].

Pressman discloses (v) repeating steps (c)(iii) at least one time for at least one second questioning theme [see G. The Patentability Flowchart page 5 / 21 – 5 / 23].

Finally, the motivation remains the same.

Response to Arguments

15. Applicant argues, *Pressman* does not disclose the steps of: 1) selecting a first questioning theme selected to elicit from at least one inventor at least one enhancement of at least one of a plurality of aspects of a basic invention; 2) eliciting from the at least one inventor at least one of the aspects of the basic invention that relates to said first questioning theme and 3) eliciting from the inventor via the first questioning theme the at least one enhancement. Moreover, facilitating conception of inventive elements using creative stimulus comprising how-type questions, and the step of communicating to the at least one inventor the concept of a ladder of abstraction.

18. Examiner agrees, however, it is the examiner's position that *Klenosky* discloses the aforementioned steps: 1) selecting a first questioning theme selected to elicit from at least one inventor at least one enhancement of at least one of a plurality of aspects of a basic invention [see

Means-End Theory & General Methodology for Assessing Means-End Relationships, page 363-365]; 2) eliciting from the at least one inventor at least one of the aspects of the basic invention that relates to said first questioning theme [*see* Means-End Theory & General Methodology for Assessing Means-End Relationships, page 363-365]; and 3) eliciting from the inventor via the first questioning theme the at least one enhancement [*see* Means-End Theory & General Methodology for Assessing Means-End Relationships, page 363-365]. Moreover, facilitating conception of inventive elements using creative stimulus comprising how-type questions, and the step of communicating to the at least one inventor the concept of a ladder of abstraction [*see* Means-End Theory & General Methodology for Assessing Means-End Relationships, page 363-365].

Examiners Summary

16. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).
17. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Correspondence Information

17. Any inquires concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael B. Holmes, who may be reached Monday through Friday, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. EST. or via telephone at (571) 272-3686 or facsimile transmission (571) 273-3686 or email Michael.holmesb@uspto.gov.

If you need to send an Official facsimile transmission, please send it to (571) 273-8300.

If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful the Examiner's Supervisor, Anthony Knight, may be reached at (571) 272-3687.

Hand-delivered responses should be delivered to the Receptionist @ (Customer Service Window Randolph Building 401 Dulany Street Alexandria, VA 22313), located on the first floor of the south side of the Randolph Building.

Michael B. Holmes
Patent Examiner
Artificial Intelligence
Art Unit 2121
United States Department of Commerce
Patent & Trademark Office

Wednesday, October 26, 2005

MBH



Anthony Knight
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group 3600